APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/502,728	02/11/2000	Wesley DeWayne Lindquist	9203/013	5595

24283   7590   12/27/2002

PATTON BOGGS
PO BOX 270930
LOUISVILLE, CO 80027

EXAMINER
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/502,728	LINDQUIST, WESLEY DEWAYNE
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Srirama Channavajjala	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 October 2002</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15,17-24 and 26-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15,17-24 and 26-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> .	6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 10/9/200, paper no.7.

2.   Claims 16, 25 have been cancelled, paper no. # 7.

3.   Claims 1-20,24,26-29 have been amended, paper no. # 7.

4.   Claims 1-15, 17-24, 26-32 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   The information disclosure statement filed on 2/11/2000, paper no. # 2, has been

considered and a copy was enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 4.

6.   The information disclosure statement filed on 10/15/2002, paper no. # 5, has

been considered and a copy was enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 8.

Drawings

7.   The formal drawings filed on 2/11/2000, have been <u>approved</u> by the Draftsperson

under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application

being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily

published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7.   Claims 1-3, 8-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Conmy et al., [hereafter Conmy], US Patent No.6101480.

8.   As to Claims 1 and 8, Conmy teaches a system which including 'a data

Management system for automatically maintaining address information in plurality of

subscriber address books' [see Abstract, col 1, line 60-65,fig 1, element 202, element

212], examiner interpreting address book corresponds to Conmy's electronic calendar

that maintains name and address book for users as detailed in col 1, line 62-64, plurality

of subscriber address books corresponds to fig 1, element 212 'means for storing for

each of a plurality of subscribers, a subscriber address book comprising a plurality of

entries, each entry corresponding to a named individual' [col 1, line 60-67, col 2, line 1-3, col 3, line 45-55, fig 1], Conmy specifically teaches database element 200 stores one or more profiles, element 202, one or more calendar files element 210, and one or more name and addresses files element 212 as detailed in fig 1, further it is noted that name and addresses files element 212 containing list all of the names and electronic mail addresses for a plurality or all of the users as detailed in col 3, line 51-53,also it is noted that Conmy specifically teaches for example name and address file may be created for each invitee, [col 3, line 52-53], the user calendar file(s) are associated with user profiles, names and address as detailed in fig 1, 'means for storing a set of individual data, including address data, for each individuals listed in each subscriber address book for said plurality of subscribers' [col 3, line 38-49, line 66-67, col 4, line 1-5], subscribers corresponds to users, individual data including address data for each individual corresponds to user profiles associated with respective names and addresses as detailed fig 1, element 202, 212, 'responsive to a change in a set of said individual data associated with an identified individual, for propagating said change to ones of said plurality of subscriber address books which contain an entry corresponding to said identified individual' [col 8, line 66-67, col 9, line 1-5, col 10, line 34-39], Conmy teaches specifically name/address book is kept for each person at each domain, further electronic mail address and calendar for each person are in the same database, so that calendar information may be exchanged, identified individual corresponds to user based on user profile.

9.   As to Claims 2 and 9, Conmy teaches a system which including 'storing data to delimit which ones of said address books, which contain an entry corresponding to said identified individual, are authorized to receive said change to said individual data' [col 9, line 18-20, line 23-33, line 30-32], Conmy teaches for example a user may send a event to anyone from the Notes name and address book as detailed in col 9, line 18-19, that corresponds to identified specific user or individual authorized to receive information, further event invitee may accept, decline, delegate or a substitute and like, that response may be automatically updates the calendars as detailed in col 9, line 30-32, individual data corresponds to user data based on user profile as detailed in fig 1.

10.   As to Claim 3, 10, are individually similar in scope to claims 2 and 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 4-7 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conmy et al. [hereafter Conmy], US Patent No. 6101480 as applied to claim1,8 above, and further in view of Taylor et al., [hereafter Tylor], US Patent No. 5754306.

12.   As to Claims 4 and 11, Conmy teaches a system which including 'storing data,

individual data' [see col 3, line 44-50], Conmy specifically teaches one or more

databases that store one or more profiles, calendar files, addresses files and like as

detailed in col 3, line 45-50. It is however, noted that Conmy does not teach 'storing

access level data to delimit which ones of said sets of address book data are authorized

to receive said change to sets of address book data'. On the other hand, Taylor

teaches a system which including 'storing access level data to delimit which ones of

said sets of address book data are authorized to receive said change to sets of address

book data' [col 26, line 49-56, col 28, line 28-32].

It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Taylor et al. into electronic calendar

with group scheduling and automated scheduling of Conmy et al. because Conmy is

directed to network based electronic calendars, schedulers, and tasking systems for

groups of users [see col 1, line 21-23], while Taylor is directed to automata ion of

electronic communication system, more particularly, relates to an integrated system for

electronic mail, facsimile transmission, and synchronization among distributed

computers [see col 1, line 12-16], both are directed specifically address cards or

address book that manages a database of names, addresses, phone numbers,

electronic mail and like [see Taylor: col 7, line 47-55; Conmy: see col 3, line 38-43].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been

motivated to modify Conmy's reference, more specifically modifying Conmy's fig 1 to

incorporate properties of fig 21, element 2200 of Tylor that including gust privileges or

access level(s) because that would have allowed users of Conmy's network based

electronic calendars, schedulers, taking system for groups of users to control which

relative combinations of individual access levels to various information available on the

database(s) satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Tylor et al.[see col 3, line 64-67,

col 4, line 1-11].

13.   As to Claims 5 and 12, Taylor teaches a system which including 'defining groups

of address books, which contain an entry corresponding to said identified individual that

are authorized to received said change to said individual data' [col 26, line 49-56,

fig 21], individual data corresponds to guest privileges

14.   As to Claims 6 and 13, Taylor teaches a system which including 'retrieving data

from a public database to verify a set of individual data associated with an identified

individual' [col 28, line 34-42].

15.   As to Claims 7 and 14, Taylor teaches a system which including 'responsive to

said means for retrieving identifying a change in data in said individual data associated

with an identified individual, for activating said means for propagating'

[col 10, line 28-43].

16.   Claims 15-16,24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

O'Flaherty et al., [hereafter O'Flaherty], US Patent No.6253203.

17.   As to Claims 15, 24, O'Flaherty teaches a system which including 'a data

management system for automatically maintaining user data among a plurality of

communities, each of which contains a plurality of members' [see Abstract, col 2, line

21-29], database management system corresponds to O'Flaherty's fig 1, automatically

maintaining user data among a plurality of communities corresponds to collection of

personal data of individual user or consumer or customer for example proliferation of

membership as detailed in col 2, line 21-29, plurality of communities corresponds to

banking, shopping , and like as detailed in col 1, line 57-63; 'means for storing for each

of a plurality of communities, community membership data comprising a plurality of

entries, each entry corresponding to a named individual who is a member of said

community' [col 1, line 57-67, col 2, line 57-67, col 7, line 1-15], examiner interpreting

plurality of entries, each entry corresponding to a named individual corresponds to

O'Flaherty's fig 2A, 3A, community membership corresponds to either banking, credit

card transaction profile and like as detailed in col 1, line 57-60, 'storing a set of

individual data for each of said individuals listed as a member in each community for

said plurality of communities' [see fig 2A,3A], O'Flaherty specifically teaches for

example a logical model of the secure data warehouse that containing customer table

element 202 having identity information, personal information, as detailed in fig 2A,3A,

'providing a user with access to a set of said individual data of an identified individual

who is a member of a same community as said user' [col 8, line 35-49], O'Flaherty

teaches privileged view element 262 permits viewing, analysis, and alternation of

information, more specifically user to view, specify, and change consumer privacy

preferences that belongs to same community such as scaleable data warehouse

customers as detailed in col 8, line 45-49, 'responsive to a change in individual data

associated with said identified individual, for propagating said change to all of said

plurality of communities in which said individual is a member' [col 8, line 35-47, col 10,

line 9-16, line 32-39], O'Flaherty teaches updating consumer or customer's privileged

requirements for example inserting new customers, deleting old customer, and

customer's profile and like, further it is also noted that detailed customer profile is

collected and propagated to database as detailed in col 10, line 35-39.

18.   Claims 17- 23, and 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over O'Flaherty et al. [hereafter O'Flaherty], US Patent No. 6253203 as

applied to claim15, 24 above, and further in view of Page, WO 94/16398

19.   As to Claims 17 and 26, O'Flaherty teaches a system which including 'defining a

set of data sharing permissions, each of which define access members of by a

community"[fig 2B], especially security information CaT1, CAT2, CAT3, also see fig 3C,

element 208, 'sharing said individual data among predetermined members of each

community who are identified by said set of permissions' [col 5, line 10-21, col 8,

line 35-44]. It is however, noted that O'Flaherty does not specifically teach 'subset of

the member's data'. On the other hand, Page teaches a system which including 'subset of the member's data' [see page 25, line 3-23, fig 4, fig 7].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Page into enforcing privacy constraints on a database management system of O'Flaherty because both O'Flaherty, and Page are directed to database management, more specifically, O'Flaherty is directed to database management system that is used to collect, store, analyze data [see Abstract], while Page is directed to accessing data by identifying membership of the item to particular groups, further groups allow data to be obtained for all items which are within the group [see Abstract]. One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to modify O'Flaherty et al. reference, more specifically modifying O'Flaherty's logical model fig 2A, 3A to incorporate Page's groups and subgroup table as detailed in fig 4 because that would have allowed uses of O'Flaherty database management system that is used to collect, store, analyze data to specifically control which relative combinations of subset of the member's data available from various information sources, further implementing privacy preferences of O'Flaherty [see col 7, line 13-14] satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Page [see page 21, line 12-17].

20.   As to Claim 18 and 27, O'Flaherty teaches a system which including 'retrieving

data from a public database to verify a set of individual data associated with an

identified individual' [see fig 3A, element 204], element 204 is directed to customer table

containing various fields of each individual data associated with an identified individual

such as name, address, account no. and like as detailed in fig 3A.

21.   Claims 19 and 28 are individually similar in scope to Claims 18 and 27 and are

therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

22.   As to Claims 20 and 29, O'Flaherty teaches a system which including 'a set of

individual data of an identified individual for generating at least one gift giving selection

for said identified individual' [fig 3A, col 13, line 56-63, col 14, line 40-44].

23.   As to Claims 21 and 30, O'Flaherty teaches a system which including 'user

approving at least one of said gift giving selections for said identified individual, for

fulfilling said gift giving selection' [fig 3A, col 13, line 56-63, col 14, line 40-44].

24.   As to Claims 22 and 31, O'Flaherty teaches a system which including

'transmitting said gift giving selection to a third party vendor' [col 4, line 30-34, col 9,

line 9-12], third party corresponds to O'Flaherty's third party detailed in fig 3B,

element 112.

25.   As to Claims 23 and 32, O'Flaherty teaches a system which including 'retrieving

gift selection data from a third party vendor' [col 4, line 30-34, col 9, line 9-12],

'displaying images [see fig 9, element 260,264,266], 'responsive to a user approving at

least one of said gift giving selections for said identified individual, for fulfilling said gift

giving selection' [fig 3A, col 13, line 56-63, col 14, line 40-44].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/9/2002, paper no. # 7 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see the discussion

below:

26.   .At page 10, line 14-16, Claims 1,8, applicant argues 'the Conmy fails to show or

suggest management of the users' personal address books, since this system is………

As to the above argument, Examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly

Conmy is directed to electronic calendar that with group(s) of users to share information

in a client/server environment [see fig 1], secondly, Conmy teaches various elements in

a database that including for example various users associated with individual profiles

such as user profiles element 202, individual user calendar files element 210 and

names and addresses element 212 as detailed in fig 1, and thirdly, all the listed above

elements are part of database element 200, further it is noted that names and address

are related to user profiles or treated to be users personal address book used for group

scheduling based on user availability as detailed in col 1, line 60-65.

27.   At page 11, line 5-10, claim 1 and 8, applicant's recited 'means for storing, for

each ....[see above detailed office action], for example means for storing for

each of a plurality of subscribers, a subscriber address book comprising a plurality of

entries, each entry corresponding to a named individual' [col 1, line 60-67, col 2, line 1-

3, col 3, line 45-55, fig 1], Conmy specifically teaches database element 200 stores one

or more profiles, element 202, one or more calendar files element 210, and one or more

name and addresses files element 212 as detailed in fig 1, further it is noted that name

and addresses files element 212 containing list all of the names and electronic mail

addresses for a plurality or all of the users as detailed in col 3, line 51-53,also it is noted

that Conmy specifically teaches for example name and address file may be created for

each invitee, [col 3, line 52-53], the user calendar file(s) are associated with user

profiles, names and address as detailed in fig 1.

28.   As to arguments at page 11, line 13-15, dependent claims 4-7,11-14 are rejected

based on the independent claims, and examiner applies arguments above discussed.

29.   At page 12, line 13-16, Claims 15, 24, O'Flaherty system does not operate to

manage a plurality of community address books or automatically change an individuals

address..........

30.   As to the above argument, examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly,

O'Flaherty is directed to privacy enhanced database, more specifically, database

management that is to collect user or customer data, analyze data [see Abstract],

secondly, O'Flaherty teaches a community in which user or customer is part of that

community such as shopping, banking and like [col 1, line 57-63], thirdly, O'Flaherty

maintains user or customer or consumer profile, that identifies potential customers

transaction habits or trends and like based on user profile. It is however noted that

applicant arguments are directed to address books, individual address book

data.......... this language is not found in the independent Claims 15 and 24.

31.   As to arguments at page 13, dependent claims 17-23,26-32 are rejected based

on the independent claims, and examiner applies arguments above discussed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	6101480
b.	US Patent No.	5754306
c.	US Patent No.	6253203
d	WO 94/16398	

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

e.	EP0944003	
f.	US Patent No.	5960409
g.	US Patent No.	6311185
h.	US Patent No.	6009410
i.	US Patent No.	6202083
j.	US Patent No.	5724521
k.	US Patent No.	5813009

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is

(703) 308-8538.   The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from

8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is

(703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as

follows:

703/746-7238   **(After Final Communication)**

703/746-7239   **(Offical Communications)**

703/746-7240   **(For Status inquiries, draft communication)**

(703) 308-6606   **(Art Unit)**

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(703) 305-9600.

SC

Patent Examiner.
December 16, 2002.